



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS OF THE DELEGATES TO THE CONGRÈS GÉOLOGIQUE INTERNATIONAL.

On March 3, 1891, the Council of the Anthropological Society received a communication from the secretary of the organizing committee of the Congrès Géologique International inviting participation in the approaching congress. A delegation was appointed, composed of Messrs. W J McGee, Thomas Wilson, and William H. Holmes.

In the division of labor foreseen by the council, it fell to Mr. Holmes to establish relations with the local committees of the scientific societies meeting in Washington and to provide for an excursion to interesting archæologic localities; to Mr. Wilson to aid the local committees of the different societies, and particularly the committee on organization of the congress, in extending the hospitality of the city to distinguished visitors from foreign countries and in providing the various arrangements requisite for the success of a numerously attended meeting, and to Mr. McGee to secure the acceptance of the credentials of the delegation and to participate freely in the deliberations of the congress.

The delegates attended the meeting of the council of this Society held on the 3d instant, and after presenting a brief oral report were instructed to present a more formal report before the society at large at the next succeeding meeting. After consideration, the delegates decided that the duty to the Society imposed upon them by the council could be best performed by the presentation of separate reports, which are here appended.

REPORT BY MR. MCGEE.

The Congrès Géologique International held in Washington, August 27 to September 1, 1891, included among its participants many geologists of world-wide reputation, who are also students of anthropology, and of whom several are specialists in archæology; and accordingly the deliberations of the congress were in some measure influenced by the facts and opinions of anthropology. This influence was most profoundly felt during the second day, which was

devoted to discussion of the classification of the Pleistocene or Quaternary—the earliest of the great geologic periods in which man is commonly supposed to have existed. In the course of this discussion different bases of classification were presented at some length: Thus, Chamberlin urged the desirability of classifying Pleistocene deposits, first, according to structure; second, according to age; and third, according to genesis. Gaudry pointed out that in the Parisian basin there are two horizons of deposits distinguished by different faunas, the one indicating a cold and the other a warm climate, the relative antiquity of the deposits being unknown—*i. e.*, his classification is partly structural, partly paleontologic, but not chronologic, and therefore useless in determining the antiquity of man. Credner, representing the plains of northern Germany, and Baron De Geer, speaking for Scandinavia, followed Chamberlin's classification. Hughes, speaking for England, referred the Pleistocene phenomena to a single comparatively brief period, while Wahn-schaffe recognized the repetition of glacial conditions during different epochs of the Pleistocene in the phenomena of the German lowlands. M. and Mme. Pavlow, of Russia, and Messrs. Shaler, Gilbert, and Cope, of this country; Diener, of Austria; Holst, of Sweden, and Christie and Cadell, of Scotland, accepted Chamberlin's classification with minor modifications. McGee held that the land forms produced concurrently with deposition are equally useful with deposits in the classification of the Pleistocene, and urged that geologic classifications be based primarily on genesis, second, on attendant conditions (by which structure is determined), and third, on chronology.

The discussion was significant to American archæology in three ways: In the first place, it appears that European geologists generally do not, while American geologists do, separate the Pleistocene into different periods of ice invasion, and recognize a succession of epochs in that period each characterized by wide-spread though not necessarily distinct faunas and floras. It follows that the time classification employed on this side of the Atlantic is more refined than that employed abroad, and hence that, so far as it goes, the evidence of the geologic antiquity of man is more decisive in America than in Europe. In the second place, it appears that in general greater antiquity is ascribed to man by European investigators than by Americans; but how much of the difference should be ascribed to the more definite chronology on this side of the Atlantic could not

be ascertained. In the third place, it may be noted that no participant in the discussion proposed to classify any part of the Pleistocene deposits by the human relics contained therein.

The influence of anthropology, and particularly of archæology, was perhaps more decidedly manifested in the informal discussions among friendly groups than in the formal discussion of the congress ; but the facts and opinions thus garnered are not so readily susceptible of generalization and statement, and are much more liable to warping through individual predilection when attempt is made to state them. Nevertheless a few salient impressions are worth offering to the Society : With respect to the American phenomena as interpreted by both foreign and American geologists and archæologists, it would seem (1) that the evidence of the antiquity of man found in the association of human remains with highly differentiated implements in the auriferous gravels beneath deeply eroded lava sheets on the Pacific coast is now pretty generally accepted, but it is recognized that the age of these deposits, measured by any trustworthy chronologic scale of the geologist, is unknown ; and it would seem (2) that the lines of the partly chronologic and partly natural classification of primitive man into paleolithic, neolithic, etc., are weakening, partly because the apparently old Pacific coast antiquities are of highly differentiated type, and partly because in the Potomac valley and elsewhere antiquities of primitive type are found to be of comparatively recent origin. On the whole, it would appear that current opinion with respect to the antiquity of man in this country is tending toward conservatism, or, in other words, toward the shortening of the period spanned by human existence in geologic history. With respect to European archæology even less may safely be said ; but it seems just to infer from the public utterances of Hughes, the eminent geologist of Cambridge, England, and from the informal expressions of Credner and Wahnschaffe, of Germany ; of the Pavlows and Schmidt, of Russia ; of De Geer and Holst, of Sweden, and of several other distinguished geologists concerned with the problems of archæology, that the recent swing of the American opinion-pendulum toward conservatism is followed, or indeed preceded, and with increased force, in Europe—in Europe as in this country the present tendency appears to be toward shortening of the prehistoric period of human life. Certainly it may be said that in Europe as in this country human remains are no longer used as criteria in the classification of Pleistocene phenomena ; and in

Europe, as in this country, when such remains are found in apparently old deposits the student immediately questions (1) whether the age of the deposit is so great as appearances indicate, and (2) whether the association is not adventitious.

Perhaps the principal benefit resulting to the Anthropological Society from participation in the congress is that naturally flowing from the association of its members with the leaders in cognate scientific thought from other lands. In this respect the occasion may well be, for members of the Society, worthy of the commemoration secured through the presentation of the formal reports of the delegates honored by their courtesy.

REPORT BY MR. WILSON.

The International Geological Congress of Washington did not give any direct consideration to the question of fossil man; nevertheless its discussions were not without interest to the prehistoric anthropologist. The questions presented by the committee of management for consideration were—

1. A system of classification of Quaternary deposits.
2. The correlation of geological formations.
3. A system of colors for geological maps.

The discussion of the first question ran largely upon glacial deposits, with intent to classify them. Herein they indirectly dealt with prehistoric man, although he was not mentioned.

There were present from the United States 173 members, of whom 10 were ladies. From foreign countries there were 75, of whom 6 were ladies, as follows: Great Britain, 14; Sweden, 4; Germany, 23; France, 4; Belgium, 4; Austro-Hungary, 3; Switzerland, 2; Russia, 9; Roumania, 4; Canada, 3; Mexico, 3; Chili, 1; Peru, 1. The greater number of these were, as was to be expected, geologists and paleontologists, pure and simple; but some of them have been much interested in the subject of prehistoric anthropology and have given as much of their attention and study to the investigation of fossil man as to any other fossil. Prof. Albert Gaudry and MM. Marcellin Boule and Max Lohest may be named as those who have attained reputation in this regard. I had seen and heard these gentlemen in other congresses and societies, on occasions when they turned their attention to the subject of fossil man, and I can assure the Anthropological Society that if these gentlemen could have given addresses upon that subject it would have been of great interest.

In the last International Congress of Archæology and Prehistoric Anthropology, Professor Gaudry opened the discussion upon the first question, "The denudation and filling of valleys, the filling of the caverns, and their relation to the antiquity of man." The points of his address were (1) Glacial and Interglacial Formations; (2) The Great Glacial Age; (3) The Cutting of the Valleys.

M. Boule was also then present and took an active part in the proceedings. His principal address was on "The Periodicity of Glacial Phenomena," though he did not confine himself to this subject during the congress. He was one of the secretaries, and has been charged with the preparation of the volume of proceedings relating to man during the Quaternary geologic period. He has made several cavern explorations in search of prehistoric man, notably the Grotte de Reilhac (Lot). He is frequently associated with M. Cartailhac in his investigations.

Mons. Max Lohest, in company with his colleague, Mons. J. Fraipont, were the fortunate discoverers of the prehistoric men in the Cavern of Spy, near Dinant, Belgium; but the other Belgians, the Russians, Roumanians, and Scandinavians were all more or less interested in the investigations of prehistoric man.

While there was no official visit made to my department by the congress, yet many of the foreign members individually desired to see the objects belonging to the prehistoric man of North America. My attendance at the congress was interfered with because of the greater necessity of my attendance at the Museum to receive these visitors. Some members made not one, but two and three visits, and, passing from case to case with note-book in hand, they continually expressed their surprise and pleasure at the many new things which were shown bearing upon the subject of prehistoric man. The knowledge which they displayed, the interest which they manifested, the appreciation which they showed of this part of the Museum pleased me much.

The interest of these foreign gentlemen tended toward the evidence of man's existence in the Quaternary geologic period. The evidences of high antiquity attracted them most; they were not so much interested in American human industry of the Neolithic period. I could see plainly that they were all geologists and paleontologists, and their interest in my department centered in those places where the science of prehistoric anthropology came in contact with theirs.

Mons. Max Lohest had prepared a paper giving a report of his and Mons. Fraipont's discoveries of the most ancient human remains in the Cavern of Spy and their conclusions as to the geological formation. This paper was relegated to the meeting of the American Society of Geologists, which met a few days prior to the Geological Congress, and here it was unfortunately crowded out. A résumé is published in the *American Naturalist* for November, 1891, p. 1034, and in the bulletins of the society. It was of special interest to me, not only because of the antiquity of the man discovered, but because I had lived in that country and visited this grotto, had seen the objects which had been gathered therefrom, and had heard Mons. Fraipont and Lohest describe their find and show the objects at the International Congress of Prehistoric Archæology at Paris in 1889.

The prehistoric anthropologist must lean largely for support upon the geologist. If this Geological Congress had been a congress on prehistoric anthropology many of the foreign gentlemen present could, with propriety, have continued to take part in the proceedings. The relations are closer between the two sciences in Europe than in America, possibly because the science of prehistoric anthropology may have progressed farther in Europe than in America. The relations of fossil man to geology are better defined there than here, probably through the efforts of the geologists themselves.

I agree with my colleague, Mr. McGee, in the difficulty of stating opinions obtained in "informal discussions among friendly groups" and the danger in reporting them of "their being warped through individual predilection," as any one may discover who reads our separate reports. I am, with reluctance, compelled to differ with him as to the conclusions stated in the latter portion of his report.

REPORT BY MR. HOLMES.

During the sessions of the Geologic Congress I was so fully occupied with matters pertaining to and resulting from the meeting of the American Association that I had little opportunity of attending the meetings of the Congress. There appears to be little to add to the reports of my colleagues. Early in the week I had the pleasure of conducting an excursion to the ancient boulder quarries and implement shops of Rock Creek valley. Several members of the Congress attended and observed with much interest the novel phenomena of the Piny Branch site. Numerous excavations were made, exposing pits and deposits of refuse, so that the true nature of the ancient work—the quarrying and manufacture—was readily understood. It

would seem that similar phenomena are well known in England and upon the Continent, and that, in some cases at least, the lines between specialized tools and the unspecialized forms of the quarries and shops have been drawn with care and accuracy. Our recent investigations on this side of the Atlantic have added to the clearness of these distinctions and have served to throw much new light upon one of the most important of the aboriginal industries—the search for and the acquirement of stone for use in the arts.

An excursion, made later in the week, to Pope's Creek, on the Potomac, afforded members of the Congress an opportunity of viewing one of the best examples of the aboriginal shell banks so numerous in the tidewater country. The heavy deposits of oyster shells, covering many acres of ground, and the evidences of long and extensive occupation visible on every hand made a deep impression upon the visitors. It was observed that the great extent and depth of these artificial formations and their very general distribution make it necessary to assign them a place in the geologic column.

NATCHEZ.—After the massacre of the French garrison and inhabitants of Natchez, Mississippi (1729) and the third French-Natchez war (1730), the remnants of these Indians were dispersed. One portion was received among the Chicasas, and from there went over to the Creeks. By these they were settled on an eastern tributary of Coosa river, near Abikudshi town, and when the general removal of the Creeks to the Indian Territory took place (1836–1840) they emigrated with them. Some who still speak the language live at Abika, ten miles from Eufaula railroad station; others exist in the Cherokee country. I learned from an old Natchez man of Abika that their tribal name should be pronounced Ná'htchi (with *a* long); it probably contains a Caddo word meaning “woods,” “forest,” and the name of the Neches river, in eastern Texas, may be of the same origin. Ramsey, in his “Annals of Tennessee,” speaks about Yuchees having been settled among the Cherokees on the Hiyawassi river; but when Mr. Mooney visited these parts in 1890 he was informed by a responsible authority, Wafford, that this statement resulted from a confounding of Aniyútsi, the Cherokee form for “Yuchi people,” with Aniná'htsi, “Natchez people,” and that the tribe referred to were real Natchez, who had there a “regular town incorporated with the Cherokees.” They arrived there with the

Creeks (1760-1770), and Wafford, who is now ninety years of age, remembers that in his youth they spoke their paternal language. Subsequently the Cherokees drove out the Creeks, but the Natchez were allowed to remain.

The Natchez who live in the Creek nation have been incorporated into their confederacy and have accepted the Creek totems, with the exception of three. The ruling class among them was called the "Suns," and they appear to have been simply a clan or gens of that name. The French report that they called the sun *wá shithl*, "great fire," but to-day this celestial body is called by them *wi'ta kwakship*, "day luminary." Sun and moon gentes exist also among the Maricopas on Gila river, Arizona: *nyá-ash*, sun; *khalásh*, moon; and among the Ottawas, *kshí'ki ki'sis tú'tām* and *tepi'ki ki'sis tú'tām*, "day-sun totem" and "night-sun totem," respectively, with two star totems. The latter have thirty-nine clans.

The Isleta Indians of New Mexico have a sun-clan, as ascertained by Mr. A. F. Bandelier and Capt. J. G. Bourke, U. S. A. The other tribes among which the last-named investigator has discovered sun-clans are the Jemez, Cochiti, San Felipe, Zufi, and Moqui.*

A. S. GATSCHET.

TUTELO.—The Tutelo or Tutiri, Todiri people was first investigated by Horatio Hale, who found some individuals on the Iroquois reserve at Brantford, Ontario. While examining their language he found it to belong to the Siouan or Dakota stock, and published an account of it in the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, 1883, pp. 1-47. They call themselves Yesáng, and were, in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, known as Todirich-ronnon. They then lived in North Carolina, and a peculiar interest now attaches itself to their southern home, because three other southern tribes—the Biloxi, the Saponi, and the Kataba—have since been discovered to be of the same Siouan lineage. It may be of interest to state that Rev. J. O. Dorsey has found in the Indian Bureau at Washington a document of four pages, pretty well faded, which describes a meeting of Winnebago with Tutelo Indians at Prophets' Town, close to Tippecanoe, Indiana, in the year 1809. It is stated that the parties were able to *understand each other's language*.

A. S. GATSCHET.

* Journal of American Folk-Lore, 1890, pp. 116-117.